

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-3 are pending in the application, with Claim 1 being the independent claim. Claim 4 is sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. No new claims have been added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

The rejection of claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is respectfully traversed. The Office has indicated that in the definition of X in Claim 1, "C(C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>2</sub>" is recited twice. *Id.*, at page 3, ll. 15-16. Applicants have amended Claim 1 to remove the duplicate definition. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as currently amended, complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office has further alleged that Claims 1 and 2 are duplicates. Office Action, page 3, ll. 15-16. Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 2 depends from Claim 1. Claim 1 defines X as, "a direct single bond, selected from the group consisting of CH<sub>2</sub>,

CHCH<sub>3</sub>, C(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> or C(C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>2</sub>." Claim 2 defines X as, "a direct single bond, selected from the group consisting of CH<sub>2</sub>, C(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> or C(C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>)<sub>2</sub>." The definition of X in Claim 2 is narrower than the definition of X in Claim 1, therefore the two claims cannot be duplicates. In view of at least the above arguments, Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

## *Conclusion*

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Amdt. dated March 30, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of February 6, 2009

- 6 -

Thomas HIMMLER  
Appl. No. 10/586,491

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully  
requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

  
Cynthia M. Bouchez  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 47,438

Date: March 30, 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

946581\_1.DOC